

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 16, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendment and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

The drawings were objected to as the allegedly not showing the features of claim 21, namely a system configured to implement testing of the communications network. Applicants note that Figure 2 illustrates a number of systems for testing the communications network including the Loop Qualification System (LQS) and Network Monitoring and Analysis (NMA) systems. Thus, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9-17 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "wherein the mobile gateway interface comprises a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server." Neither APA nor Kikinis teaches or suggests these features.

APA was relied upon for disclosing a supervisor interacting with one or more resources. In the APA, the supervisor calls a colleague and the colleague interacts with resources on the supervisor's behalf. Thus, the supervisor in the APA does not interact with the resources through a mobile gateway interface comprising a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server.

Kikinis was relied upon for disclosing login request and security checks for users

accessing a WAP gateway. Kikinis, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of APA discussed above. Kikinis teaches the use of a WAP gateway 104, but does not teach a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if APA and Kikinis are combined, the subject matter of claim 1 does not result.

For at least the above reasons claim 1 is patentable over APA in view of Kikinis. Claims 2, 9, 10 and 22 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over APA in view Kikinis for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Independent claim 11 recites "wherein the mobile gateway interface comprises a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server." As discussed above with reference to claim 1, neither APA nor Kikinis teaches or suggests this feature. For at least these reasons, claim 11 is patentable over APA in view of Kikinis. Claims 6, 14 and 15 depend from claim 11 and are patentable over APA in view Kikinis for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 11.

Independent claim 16 recites "a transaction server coupled to the front-end voice server one or more front-end servers and a front-end data server." As discussed above with reference to claim 1, neither APA nor Kikinis teaches or suggests this feature. For at least these reasons, claim 16 is patentable over APA in view of Kikinis. Claims 17, 19, 20 and 24 depend from claim 16 and are patentable over APA in view Kikinis for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 16.

Independent claim 23 recites "wherein the mobile gateway interface comprises a front-end voice server, a front-end data server, and a transaction server." As discussed above with reference to claim 1, neither APA nor Kikinis teaches or suggests this feature.

For at least these reasons, claim 23 is patentable over APA in view of Kikinis.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Karlsson. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 16 and is patentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Karlsson for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 16.

Claims 3, 7 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and House. Claims 3, 7 and 25 depend from claims 1, 11 and 16, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claims 1, 11 and 16.

Claims 4, 8 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Rosse. Claims 4, 8 and 26 depend from claims 1, 11 and 16, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claims 1, 11 and 16.

Claims 5, 21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Rickli. Claims 5, 21 and 27 depend from claims 1, 11 and 16, respectively, and are patentable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claims 1, 11 and 16.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: March 16, 2006

00355
BLL-0219

12